

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-27 are patentable over the art of record and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 1-27.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Lee for holding telephone interviews with their representative, Janaki K. Davda, on Thursday, March 15, 2007. During the telephone interviews, the 35 U.S.C. 101, 112, and 102 rejections were discussed with reference to proposed claim amendments. No agreement was reached.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for reviewing and initialing references submitted in Information Disclosure Statements. In an Information Disclosure Statement received by the USPTO on April 12 2004 two references were not initialed. The references are:  
1) Lu, Z, "Scalable Distributed Architectures for Information Retrieval," dated 1999; and  
2) Tomasic, et al., "Incremental Updates of Inverted Lists for Text Document Retrieval", dated 1994. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review and initial these references.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claim 1 does not state that the method can be executable by a processor and lacks any hardware component to enable the method. Applicants respectfully traverse, but, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to be a method "being executable in a computer".

Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse. The Examiner submits that "hardware logic is not interpreted by the Examiner as part of the system." Claim 10 recites "hardware logic", which is described in Applicants' Specification, pages 9-10, paragraph 35, as "(e.g., an integrated circuit chip, Programmable Gate Array (PGA), Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC), etc.)." Applicants respectfully submit that hardware logic is an essential hardware means and should be interpreted by the Examiner as part of the system. Additionally, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 10 to include a processor and storage as recommended by Examiner Lee during the telephone interviews.

Claims 10-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 10-18 were discussed above. Additionally, during the telephone interviews, Examiner Lee indicated that a 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection would be issued based on claim 19 reciting an "article of manufacture comprising one of hardware logic and a computer readable medium including a program." Although Applicants traverse, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 19 to recite an "article of manufacture comprising a computer readable medium including a program" and reciting "wherein the program being executable by a processor causes operations to be performed".

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as vague due to the fact that it is uncertain they can operate. Applicants respectfully traverse. During the telephone interviews, Examiner Lee indicated that the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection would be withdrawn once the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections had been overcome. Applicants believe that the 101 rejections have been overcome and that the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weissman (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0243581). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Anticipation requires that the identical invention must be shown in a single reference in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants respectfully submit that the Weissman patent does not show the identical invention claimed by Applicants.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 describe forming a set of anchors that point to a target document, wherein each anchor is a path from a source document to the target document (e.g., Specification, page 5, paragraph 19; page 7, paragraph 26). The Examiner cites "Related Links" as the set of anchors. Applicants respectfully traverse and have amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to describe that each anchor is a path from a source document to the target document, which is not anticipated by the multiple matched keywords that are associated with advertisements being displayed in a single publisher's web page in a Related Links or similar section (Weissman, Paragraphs 4, 5). Also, the Weissman patent in paragraphs 23 and 48 describes a link section with a link section containing links to other web pages in the website, such as national news, weather and sports. With the Weissman patent, each link points to other information, therefore,

the link section does not anticipate forming a set of anchors that point to a target document, *wherein each anchor is a path from a source document to the target document.*

Claims 1, 10, and 19 describe grouping together anchors with same anchor text, wherein each anchor is associated with anchor text (e.g., Specification, page 5, paragraph 19; page 7, paragraph 26). Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to describe that each anchor is associated with anchor text to clarify the meaning of grouping together anchors with same anchor text. Applicants submit that this is not anticipated by the Weissman patent, which, in paragraphs 23-31, describes determining the meaning of a source web page by retrieving the source meaning or by identifying concepts contained in the web page.

Also, claims 1, 10, and 19 describe computing a relevance score for each group (i.e., of anchors with the same anchor text as claimed in the previous claim element). The Weissman patent describes that a source article is accessed, a plurality of regions in the source article are identified, and at least one local concept associated with each region is determined (Abstract). The Weissman patent also describes determining a score for each local concept in each region. Applicants submit that a local concept for a region of a source article does not anticipate a group of anchors with the same anchor text. Therefore, the Weissman patent does not anticipate computing a relevant score for each group.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 describe generating context information for the target document based on the computed relevance score, wherein a title is composed from text of a group with a highest relevance score and a summary of the target document is composed from anchor texts of a number of groups with highest relevance scores (e.g., Specification, page 8, paragraphs 29-30). The Weissman patent in paragraphs 23-25 describes local concepts and that a variety of weighing factors can be used to rank the concepts, but there is no anticipation of generating context information for the target document based on the computed relevance score, wherein a title is composed from text of a group with a highest relevance score and a summary of the target document is composed from anchor texts of a number of groups with highest relevance scores.

Therefore, claims 1, 10, and 19 are not anticipated by the Weissman patent.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27 incorporate the language of independent claims 1, 10, and 19 and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27 are not anticipated by the Weissman patent for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 10, and 19.

### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-27 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 16, 2007

By: \_\_\_/Janaki K. Davda/\_\_\_\_\_

Janaki K. Davda  
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: (310) 553-7973  
Fax: 310-556-7984